Serial No.: 10/675,344

The invention claimed by Applicants is a method for rerounding out-ofround flexible plastic pipe in which the out-of-round flexible plastic pipe is placed in a pipe passage disposed between a pair of jaws of a rerounding apparatus. It will be apparent that an out-of-round, i.e. oval, pipe has both a major axis and a minor axis, the major axis being the longest axis of the oval and the minor axis being the shortest axis of the oval. The out-of-round flexible pipe is oriented within the pipe passage such that the major axis is substantially perpendicular to the jaws or, to state it another way, substantially parallel to the direction of travel of the jaws as they close around the out-of-round pipe. The out-of-round flexible plastic pipe is compressed by reducing the distance between the jaws until the major, or initially longest, axis becomes a minor axis, forming a compressed flexible plastic pipe. Thereafter, the compressed flexible plastic pipe is decompressed by increasing the distance between the jaws, forming a substantially round flexible plastic pipe. The crux of this invention is the discovery by the inventors that, in order to obtain a truly round flexible pipe from an out-of-round, i.e. oval, flexible plastic pipe, it is necessary to compress the pipe along the line of the longest axis until the pipe is round and then further compress the pipe until the longest axis becomes the shortest axis and the previously shortest axis becomes the longest axis (i.e. over-correct or over-compress the pipe) before decompressing the pipe (Page 4, line 11 to Page 5, line 4). Serial No.: 10/675,344

Applicants respectfully urge that the prior art relied upon by the Examiner for rejection of the subject application neither teaches nor suggests the requirement of over-correction in order to obtain a round flexible plastic pipe from an initial out-of-round, or oval, flexible plastic pipe as required by the method of Applicants' claimed invention.

In response to the Amendment filed by Applicants on 04 April 2005, the Examiner has maintained the rejection of the subject application on the bases set forth in the Office Action mailed 24 March 2005. The Examiner has indicated that Applicants' arguments in response to the previous Office Action are not persuasive on the basis that the invention claimed by Applicants is an apparatus and not a method and, as such, only the structural limitations are given patentable weight and the intended use of the apparatus is given little or no patentable weight.

Applicants respectfully urge that, contrary to the assertion by the Examiner, the invention claimed by Applicants is, in fact, *a method* as described hereinabove. Accordingly, Applicants arguments as set forth in response to the Office Action mailed 24 March 2005 are equally applicable to the rejections set forth in the final Office Action and, thus, will not be repeated other than to reiterate that neither Behrens, U.S. Patent 4,583,390 nor Null et al., U.S. Patent 6,419,424 B1 teach or suggest the *method* of the invention claimed by Applicants and, thus, neither Behrens,

Serial No.: 10/675,344

U.S. Patent 4,583,390 nor Null et al., U.S. Patent 6,419,424 Blanticipate the invention claimed by Applicants in the manner required by 35 U.S.C. 102(b) or render Applicants' claimed invention obvious in the manner required by 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Applicants intend to be fully responsive to the outstanding Office Action. If the Examiner detects any issue which the Examiner believes Applicants have not addressed in this response, Applicants urge the Examiner to contact the undersigned.

Applicants sincerely believe that this patent application is now in condition for allowance and, thus, respectfully request early allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

March 18. 7

Mark E. Fejer

Regis. No. 34,817

Gas Technology Institute 1700 South Mount Prospect Road Des Plaines, Illinois 60018 TEL (847) 768-0832; FAX (847) 768-0802